



PR5
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/477,331	01/04/2000	GORDON ARNOLD	52817.000087	9092

29315 7590 04/09/2003

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

HU, JINSONG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/477,331	ARNOLD ET AL.
	Examiner Jinsong Hu	Art Unit 2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are presented for examination. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13-14, 17-19 and 22-27 have been amended.
2. The corrected Drawing has been approved by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reisman (US 6,125,388).
5. As per claim 1, Reisman teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method of managing a plurality of messages [i.e., information objects] stored in a plurality of remote object sources [col. 5, lines 6-11; 16, 18, 26, Fig. 1] comprising the steps of:

accepting a user access request at a access port to access selected ones of the plurality of remote object sources [col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 8; col. 17, lines 10-19; col. col. 32, lines]; and

transmitting a set of access requests to a corresponding set of the remote object sources [col. 5, lines 1-6; col. 15, lines 30-34].

6. Reisman does not specifically teach that the remote object sources are individual message accounts. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that replacing the remote object sources with the individual accounts because both of them perform the same function as providing the information [i.e., messages, documents or publication etc.] to client based on the client's request. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Reisman's system with the individual message accounts to make retrieving messages from sources less complicated.

7. As per claims 2-3 and 7-8, Reisman teaches the step of creating a consolidated message list, including at least the messages [i.e., fetch objects] pending in each of the selected remote object sources and transmitting the consolidated message list as an output [col. 16, lines 16-21]; transmitting a message process request which associate with the messages on consolidated list to the corresponding remote object sources [col. 18, lines 29-31].

Art Unit: 2154

8. Reisman does not specifically teach that the remote object sources are individual message accounts. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that replacing the remote object sources with the individual accounts because both of them perform the same function as providing the information [i.e., messages, documents or publication etc.] to client based on the client's request. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Reisman's system with the individual message accounts to make retrieving messages from sources less complicated.

9. As per claim 4, Reisman teaches a networked proxy server [col. 18, lines 1-7].

10. As per claims 5 and 6, Reisman teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Reisman does not specifically teach a re-assignable network address for message accounts and POP3 standard. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include them in Reisman's system because they are well-known message account management method and mail server in the art for implementing messages.

11. As per claims 9-17, since they are system claims of claims 1-4 and 6-8, they are rejected under the same basis as claims 1-4 and 6-8.

12. As per claims 18-24, since they are means claims of claims 1-4 and 6-8, they are rejected under the same basis as claims 1-4 and 6-8.
13. As per claims 25-27, since they are computer program claims of claims 1-3, they are rejected under the same basis as claims 1-3.

Conclusion

14. The argument is moot since this Action is based on new ground(s).
15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP §706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
16. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2154

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (703) 306 – 5932.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An, can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308-9052. Additionally, the fax numbers for Group 2100 are as follow:

Official Faxes: (703) 746-7239

After Final Responses: (703) 746-7238

Draft Responses: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of the application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 305-3900.

Jinsong Hu

April 4, 2003


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER